



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

Meeting of October 24, 1983

Present: Sillers, Coulter, Raftery, Chaput, Hannaford, Clarke

The meeting was called to order at 8:05 P.M. by Vice Chairman Sillers.

Minutes of October 10, 1983

The discussion of the Ember Lane Conservation Cluster states that the trail easement will be given to the Town; the actual motion to "accept in principle" says that the easement will be conveyed to the Conservation Foundation. A note should be added to the end of the paragraph on the first page, pointing out this difference (and that, in fact, the easement will be to the Conservation Foundation).

Accessory Structure for Housing for Elderly

Jean Donnelly appeared before the Board to ask what (if any) steps were necessary to allow an 8'x8'x10' high tool shed to be constructed on the site of the Elderly Housing buildings. The shed would be located behind the Sleeper Community Building. The proposed site is within the normal setback requirements for such buildings if they were on dwelling sites within District A or B. The issue is whether the shed can be constructed as a matter of right, or if some amendment procedure to the Special Permit is required.

The Zoning Bylaw for District "M" takes it out of both District A and B. There are no uses permitted by "right" in District M. There is an amendment procedure available for the Special Permit, requiring the Board to determine if a proposed change is significant upon application for such a determination.

The Board questioned whether alternative sites had been discussed for the shed. In particular, why should it be less visible to the project and more visible to passers-by? Why not bring it closer within the project (hence more accessible) and have it be less visible to passers-by? An alternative site near the front of the Community Building was proposed.

An application was submitted for an amendment to the Special Permit to allow the construction of the shed.

Motion was made and seconded to find such an amendment to be significant. Motion defeated: 0 in favor, 6 opposed. The requested amendment is therefore not a significant change to the original Special Permit.

The Board suggested that in order to approve the amendment, a revised plan should be submitted showing the location of the shed.

Release of Lots on Hemlock Estates

A release form was received to unconditionally release Lots 4A, 5A, 7A, 10A and 11A on Hemlock Estates. (Previously, there had been a conditional release.) The form was signed by three members. The fourth will sign for the notary public.

Proposed New Location of Police/Communication Facility

What did the Board members individually find?

1. The size and location of the facility was suitable.
2. The impact on the neighbors was considered a crucial concern. However, the only dwelling affected would be the Bates property across Bedford Road, and this impact would be minimal because of its elevation.
3. As a possible site for Planning Board, it was less desirable than our present facilities. There was no room that was adequate for public hearings; There was some concern for the storage of map files in what was apparently a very musty, wet basement.
4. There should be a plan of what to do with the old fire station, in concert with this plan for the police station.
5. The location of future Town office space should also be considered at this time.

The consensus was that all of the town functions should be near one another, if possible. That would require consideration now of where to put the Town Offices.

The Board will review this proposed site against the criteria it established the last time it went over various sites. This will take place at the next meeting.

Building Permit for Traub (R. Koning Letter)

The Town Building Inspector, Robert Koning, wrote the Board asking our opinion of his issuing a building permit to Peter Felix Traub for his house (and proposed "cottage industry") on Lot 8 of Curve Street.

Basically, the Board's opinion would be advisory only, with only Town Counsel being able to render a more definitive opinion.

Members felt that this use was not a matter of "right": it was neither a "profession" nor a "customary home occupation". It was at best a use that might be acceptable as permitted by Special Permit. There was some sentiment that it might more properly be "light industrial" and should be a business zone. Member Chaput suggested that we look up "dental plate manufacturing" in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual (SICM) to see how they classify this occupation. Kay Kulmala will call MAPC to see if they have the manual. Member Sillers will call Mr. Koning to tell him (1) that the Board does not consider this to be a use permitted by right and (2) that we will research it further through the SICM.

Member Raftery asked if there were any hazardous material uses involved in this trade. There are acids used in etching, as well as gold and various grinding and polishing compounds.

The meeting adjourned at 10:12 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard R. Coulter